



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,823	04/28/2006	Michael W. Trainum	1041006	2840
7590	04/22/2008		EXAMINER	
Michael Haynes 1341 Huntersfield Close Keswick, VA 22947			HOANG, SON T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2165	
			MAIL DATE	
			04/22/2008	PAPER
			DELIVERY MODE	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/577,823	TRAINUM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SON T. HOANG	2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 April 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 19 December 2007.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed on January 3, 2008.

Claims 7-8, 14, 19-22, 29-30, and 35-36, have been amended.

Claims 37-45 have been added.

Abstract's objection is withdrawn.

Specification's objection is withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 101 rejections are maintained.

35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 rejections of **claims 1-36** are maintained.

Rejections for **claims 37-45** are presented in this instant Office action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's argument with respect to **independent claims 1, 23, and 36**, regarding the fact that Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) does not teach or suggest "*automatically and individually control a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of a plurality of objects in each of multiple documents derived from the source document*".

The Examiner respectfully begs to differ with Applicant's remarks.

Accordingly, Schneid discloses the intermediate live version, i.e. source document or template, of the file has Access and Operation privileges added by the workflow users ([0029]). Schneid further discloses automatically and individually control a content, a plurality of content attributes (*Document and data*

list linking logic 600 utilized Data Lists object 414, privileges object 415, and documents object 420 to allow localizations of various versions of the document, [0035]), and a usage permission (a printer may be allowed read-only access, [0041]) of each derived/localized document version. Specifically, Schneid discloses there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications to create a localized version of the intermediate live version, [0041]). The fact that the template's elements are only accessible to a certain number of authorized users shows that each of these template's elements is protected from public exposures, or in other words, the template's elements are only for non-public access which, indeed, indicates that these template's elements have a certain distribution permission.

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.¹ Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the Examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Reference is made to MPEP 2144.01 - Implicit Disclosure

"[I]n considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968)

Subsequent to an analysis of the claims it was revealed that a number of limitations recited in the claims belong in the prior art and thus encompassed

and/or implicitly disclosed in the reference (s) applied and cited. It is logical for the Examiner to focus on the limitations that are "crux of the invention" and not involve a lot of energy and time for the things that are not central to the invention, but peripheral. The Examiner is aware of the duties to address each and every element of claims, however, it is also important that a person prosecuting a patent application before the Office or an stakeholders of patent granting process make effort to understand the level of one of ordinary skill in the (data processing) art or the level one of skilled in the (data processing) art, as encompassed by the applied and cited references. The administrative convenience derived from such a cooperation between the attorneys and Examiners benefits the Office as well the patentee.

In view of the above, the Examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the claims have been addressed in this Action.

For the above reasons, the Examiner believed that rejections of the last Office action were proper.

Hence, Applicant's arguments do not distinguish over the claimed invention over the prior art of record.

In light of the foregoing arguments, the 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 rejections are hereby sustained.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. As required by **M.P.E.P. 609(C)**, the Applicant's submission of the Information Disclosure Statement is acknowledged by the Examiner. All documents cited have been considered in the examination of the claims now

pending. As required by **M.P.E.P 609 C(2)**, a copy of the PTOL-1449 initialed and dated by the Examiner is attached to the instant Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. **Claim 43** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding **claim 43**, Applicant recites '*Edition query*', '*Shell relationship*', '*Shell of Editions*' without any explicit/deliberate definitions for these terms. Since these terms are not well-known in the art, they would leave the readers in doubt regarding their particular meanings of the claimed subject matters. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 of **claims 1-22, and 36-45** are maintained, as of this time, because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matters.

Regarding **claim 1**, a "system" is being claimed with multiple components, i.e. "a *database*", and "a *computer-based document management module*". These claimed "*database*" and "*module*" can easily

be interpreted by a person with ordinary skills in the art as software *per se* and functional descriptive material consisting of data structures and computer programs, which impart functionality when employed as a computer component.

Furthermore, the Applicant stated that “*a database*” as “*one or more structured sets of persistent data, usually associated with software to update and query the data*” (Specification, Page 3, [025]) and “*a computer-based document management module*” as “*a set of instructions for operating a processor*” (Specification, Page 5, [40]). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory.

The claimed system is directed to a software system itself, not a process occurring as a result of actually executing the software components, a machine programmed to operate in accordance with the software components, nor a manufacture structurally and functionally interconnected with the software components in a manner which enables the software components to carry out their functionalities. The claimed system is also not a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, it fails to fall within a statutory category. It is, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

Claims 2-22, and 37-45, fail to resolve the deficiencies of **claim 1** since they only further limit the scope of **claim 1**. Hence, **claims 2-22, and 37-45**, are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101.

The claims above lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either “functional descriptive material” or “nonfunctional descriptive material.” Both types of “descriptive material” are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because “[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.”)

Regarding **claim 36**, “*a machine readable medium*” is being claimed. However, the Applicant did not explicitly provide any definition and/or example for this instant “*machine readable medium*” in the disclosure. Consequently, the Examiner views this claimed “*machine readable medium*” to include “*a transmission media*” (Specification, Page 6, [41]), which typically embodies computer readable instructions, data structures, program modules or other data in modulated data signal such as carrier wave or other transport mechanism and includes any information delivery media. As such, the claims are drawn to a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore this claim is not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Energy is not a physical or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and therefore not a composition of matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate Paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this Section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. **Claims 1-9, 12, 14-17, 19-20, 23-31, 33, and 35-36**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*).

Regarding **claim 1**, Schneid clearly shows and discloses a system (*Figure 2*), comprising:

a database storing a plurality of objects ([0030], and Figure 4); and

a computer-based document management module ([0033]) adapted to:

create a source document comprising the plurality of objects (*Figure 9 shows the conversion process of a native file to the Intermediate Live file format, [0039]. It is clearly shown that the intermediate live file is the source document, i.e. template*); and

automatically and individually control a content, a plurality of content attributes (*Document and data list linking logic 600 utilized Data Lists object 414, privileges object 415, and documents object 420 to allow localizations of various versions of the document, [0035]*), a usage permission (*a printer may be allowed read-only access, [0041]*), and a distribution permission of each of a plurality of objects in

each of multiple documents (access privileges can be determined that each user may assert over each element of a brochure, [0041]. When only those with authorized privileges can access each of the derived elements, the distribution is clearly for non-public users) derived from the source document (It is shown clearly that localized versions of a document are derived from an original/source version of the document, i.e. the intermediate live file or template, [0035]).

Regarding **claim 2**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to define a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of the plurality of objects of the source document (there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).

Regarding **claim 3**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to prevent modification of a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of the plurality of objects of the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).*

Regarding **claim 4**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to publish the source document (*the system coordinates live content file conversion into an output format and delivers to an output provider, [0010]).*

Regarding **claim 5**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to generate a derived document from the source document (*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including, e.g., permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof and output ready versions of the document, [0020]).*

Regarding **claim 6**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to derive each of the multiple documents from the source document (*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including, e.g., permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof and output ready versions of the document, [0020]*).

Regarding **claim 7**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to propagate a content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission of the source document to each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 8 shows the output logic flow. Output logic 800 utilizes Templates object 411, images object 412, Fonts object 413, data lists object 414, Privileges object 415, Approvers object 417 and documents object 420 to produce Output for proofs or final output, preferably in Postscript, Portable Document format or XML. The output functions are preferably controlled using a Java interface to a work flow client, [0037]*).

Regarding **claim 8**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to prevent modification of a content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission in each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*there may be several main offices with write*

privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).

Regarding **claim 9**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to determine an identity of the source document from each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 7 shows the comment logic flow of this exemplary embodiment. Comment logic 700 utilizes privileges object 415 to operate on comment subject 416 and documents object 420. Comments and versions are tracked for each document, each object of the document and for each version by user. The comment functions are preferably executed using a Java interface to a work flow client, [0037]).*

Regarding **claim 12**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein said document management module is further adapted to language-independently search the database (*Different translations may be manually or automatically applied to sections or objects of the content, [0035]).*

Regarding **claim 14**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein each of the plurality of objects of the multiple documents is stored only once in said database (*DTP conversion 430 sends a native DTP file to Application Server 400 where Import Conversion Templates and Logic 440 operate on the Templates object 411 for each converted file, [0030]*).

Regarding **claim 15**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of content attributes comprises content formatting information (*The Import content logic 450 sends content such as JPG and EPS formatted content objects to the images object 412 and other data objects in TTF or Type 1 format to Fonts object 413, [0030]*).

Regarding **claim 16**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of content attributes comprises content type information (*The conversion processor scans the native file 920 to detect each object 950 thereof and for each object 950, a content object is parsed and stored including a value of the type of content therein, [0039]*).

Regarding **claim 17**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of content attributes comprises document structure information (*a design object 952 is parsed with location and format information and the interrelationships of each of the objects 950 and 952 are determined and stored in an object interrelation object 954. Similarly permissions object 953 may begin with standard permissions from a DTD or may be added by work flow clients, [0039]*).

Regarding **claim 19**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of objects of the source document comprises a text object (*the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]*).

Regarding **claim 20**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of objects of the source document comprises a graphical object (*the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]*).

Regarding **claim 23**, Schneid clearly shows and discloses a method (*Figure 3*), comprising a plurality of activities comprising:

via a computer-based document management module ([0033]):

creating a source document comprising a plurality of objects, each of said plurality of objects stored in a database (*Figure 9 shows the conversion process of a native file to the Intermediate Live file format. The conversion processor scans the native file to detect each object thereof and for each object, a content object is parsed and stored including a value of the type of content therein, [0039]. It is clearly shown that the intermediate live file is the source document, i.e. template*); and

automatically and individually controlling a content, a plurality of content attributes (*Document and data list linking logic 600 utilized Data Lists object 414, privileges object 415, and documents object 420 to allow localizations of various versions of the document, [0035]*]), a usage permission (*a printer may be allowed read-only access, [0041]*), and a distribution permission of each of a plurality of objects in each of multiple documents (*access privileges can be determined that each user may assert over each element of a brochure, [0041]. When only those with authorized privileges can access each of the derived elements, the distribution is clearly for non-public users*) derived from the source document (*It is shown clearly that localized versions of a document are derived from an original/source version of the document, i.e. the intermediate live file or template, [0035]*).

Regarding **claim 24**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising defining a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of the plurality of objects of the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the*

brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).

Regarding **claim 25**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising preventing modification of a content, a plurality of content attributes, a usage permission, and a distribution permission of each of the plurality of objects of the source document (*there may be several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).*

Regarding **claim 26**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising publishing the source document (*the system coordinates live content file conversion into an output format and delivers to an output provider, [0010]).*

Regarding **claim 27**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising generating a derived document from the source document (*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including,*

e.g., permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof and output ready versions of the document, [0020]).

Regarding **claim 28**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising deriving each of the multiple documents from the source document (*Work flow users may be granted various levels of permissions including, e.g., permission to assign permissions to other users. The central server may create proof and output ready versions of the document, [0020]).*

Regarding **claim 29**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising propagating a content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission of the source document to each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 8 shows the output logic flow. Output logic 800 utilizes Templates object 411, images object 412, Fonts object 413, data lists object 414, Privileges object 415, Approvers object 417 and documents object 420 to produce Output for proofs or final output, preferably in Postscript, Portable Document format or XML. The output functions are preferably controlled using a Java interface to a work flow client, [0037]).*

Regarding **claim 30**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising preventing modification of a content, plurality of content attributes, usage permission, and distribution permission in each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*there may be*

several main offices with write privileges for only certain portions of particular visual business communications. A local office would likely have permission to view the entire file, but to change only the respective localization portion of the brochure. Similarly, the printer may be allowed read-only access. For example, users may belong to a group of users with certain privilege levels. Similarly, the permission may be based on properties of a particular element, such as whether it be text or graphic, [0041]).

Regarding **claim 31**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising determining an identity of the source document from each of the multiple documents derived from the source document (*Figure 7 shows the comment logic flow of this exemplary embodiment. Comment logic 700 utilizes privileges object 415 to operate on comment subject 416 and documents object 420. Comments and versions are tracked for each document, each object of the document and for each version by user. The comment functions are preferably executed using a Java interface to a work flow client, [0037]*).

Regarding **claim 33**, Schneid further discloses a method, further comprising searching across the source document and each document derived from the source document (*Different translations may be manually or automatically applied to sections or objects of the content, [0035]*).

Regarding **claim 35**, Schneid further discloses a method, wherein each of the plurality of objects of the multiple documents is stored only once in said database (*DTP conversion 430 sends a native DTP file to Application Server 400 where Import Conversion Templates and Logic 440 operate on the Templates object 411 for each converted file, [0030]*).

Regarding **claim 36**, Schneid clearly shows and discloses a machine readable medium storing instructions executable by an information device, for activities ([Column 4, Claim 16]) comprising:

creating a source document comprising a plurality of objects, each of said plurality of objects stored in a database (*Figure 9 shows the conversion process of a native file to the Intermediate Live file format. The conversion processor scans the native file to detect each object thereof and for each object, a content object is parsed and stored including a value of the type of content therein, [0039]. It is clearly shown that the intermediate live file is the source document, i.e. template*); and

automatically and individually controlling a content, a plurality of content attributes (*Document and data list linking logic 600 utilized Data Lists object 414, privileges object 415, and documents object 420 to allow localizations of various versions of the document, [0035]*), a usage permission (a printer may be allowed read-only access, [0041]), and a distribution permission of

each of a plurality of objects in each of multiple documents (access *privileges can be determined that each user may assert over each element of a brochure, [0041]. When only those with authorized privileges can access each of the derived elements, the distribution is clearly for non-public users*) derived from the source document (*It is shown clearly that localized versions of a document are derived from an original/source version of the document, i.e. the intermediate live file or template, [0035]*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. **Claims 10-11, and 32,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Hallett et al. (*Pub. No. US 2004/0216033, filed on April 23, 2003; hereinafter Hallett*).

Regarding **claims 10, and 32,** Schneid does not explicitly disclose a bi-directional comparison of the source document and a derivative document derived from the source document.

Hallett discloses validating one or more data blocks in a document derived from another document includes one or more processors collectively operable to access a number of first values in a predetermined portion of a source document and apply a code-generating algorithm to the first values to generate a first code representing the first values in the predetermined portion of the source document. The one or more processors are further operable to access a number of second values in a predetermined portion of a document derived from the source document, the predetermined portion of the derived document corresponding to the predetermined portion of the source document, and apply the code-generating algorithm to the second values to generate a second code representing the second values in the predetermined portion of the derived document. If the first code representing the first values in the predetermined portion of the source document matches the second code representing the second values in the predetermined portion of the

derived document, it can be assumed that within a predefined probability the derived document was accurately derived from the source document in that the second values in the predetermined portion of the derived document match the first values in the predetermined portion of the source document (0004]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Hallett with the teachings of Schneid for the purpose of reducing or eliminating the error in validating document data by comparing data blocks of the derived document with data blocks of the source document ([0003] and [Abstract] of Hallett).

Regarding **claim 11**, Hallett further discloses a system to perform a bi-directional comparison of a first derivative document derived from the source document and a second derivative document derived from the source document (Figures 5A & 5B).

13. **Claims 13, and 34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Withgott et al. (*Pat. No. US 5,491,760, published on February 13, 1996; hereinafter Withgott*).

Regarding **claims 13, and 34**, Schneid does not disclose generating an auxiliary document from the source document, the auxiliary document reflecting at least a portion of a structure of the source

document, at least a portion of a content of the auxiliary document differing from a content of the source document.

Withgott discloses the second phase of the document analysis involves processing (step 50) the identified significant image units to produce an auxiliary or supplemental document image reflective of the contents of the source document image. It will be appreciated that the format in which the identified significant image units are presented can be varied as desired. Thus, the identified significant image units could be presented in reading order to form one or more phrases, or presented in a listing in order of relative frequency of occurrence. Likewise, the supplemental document image need not be limited to just the identified significant image units ([Column 33, Lines 46-65]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Withgott with the teachings of Schneid for the purpose of automatically excerpting and summarizing a document image without decoding or otherwise understanding the contents thereof ([Column 3, Lines 9-12] of Withgott).

14. **Claims 18, and 21-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Jones et al. (*Pub. No. US 2002/0188841, published on December 12, 2002; hereinafter Jones*).

Regarding **claim 18**, Schneid does not explicitly disclose the plurality of content attributes comprises content creator information.

Jones discloses a watermark is embedded into media content and the watermark conveys watermark information, such as a content identifier and creator identifier, ([0008]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Jones with the teachings of Schneid for the purpose of enabling digital asset management to reliably link media content with additional data about the content using watermarks ([0008] of Jones).

Regarding **claim 21**, Jones further discloses the plurality of objects of the source document comprises an audio object ([0049]).

Regarding **claim 22**, Schneid further discloses a system, wherein the plurality of objects of the source document comprises a video object ([0049]).

15. **Claims 37, and 43-44,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Flores et al. (*Pat. No. US 6,370,498, published on April 9, 2002; hereinafter Flores*).

Regarding **claim 37**, Schneid does not disclose the limitation of this instant claim.

Flores discloses allowing a user to search for a user-selected topic in each of the multiple documents and in the source document regardless of differences in language between the source document and at least one of the multiple documents (*The user will first select a particular work to view, generally chosen from a provided menu listing the works available on the database. Typically, once a work is selected, the user will be provided with a list of languages that the work is available in. For example, a user might choose the Shakespearean play of Hamlet and indicate that the languages the user would like to read the play in are Japanese and Portuguese. The software accesses the database, retrieving and then displaying for the user's view translations of Hamlet in both Japanese and Portuguese, [Column 6, Lines 28-42]).*

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Flores with the teachings of Schneid for the purpose of providing a searching system that is beneficial for mono-lingual and/or multi-lingual users in researching by retrieving and displaying a particular work in multiple languages ([Column 3, Lines 46-52] of Flores).

Regarding **claim 43**, Flores further discloses the computer-based document management module is adapted to, responsive to initiation of a search by a user, perform a database query, and responsive to a determination that the database query has returned data, the computer-based document management module adapted to perform an Edition

query that uses a Shell relationship to identify all other Editions in a Shell of Editions returned in the database query (*each translation conveys the sense and contextual meaning of the original work rather than being a literal translation. In this manner, each translation of a work is a closer equivalent to the other translations of that same work in other languages.* This method of extending translation to a more contextual meaning eliminates the need for direct word per word translations between every possible combination of languages which was the obstacle limiting the number of bilingual publications, [Column 5, Lines 27-63]. Note that when a user queries for a work, *all possible translations will be presented in a list for user to choose from*, [Column 6, Lines 28-42]).

Regarding **claim 44**, Flores further discloses the computer-based document management module is adapted to, responsive to entry of one or more search terms by a user, perform a database query, the query adapted to return to the user a search result in a different language from that of the one or more search terms *For example, a user might choose the Shakespearean play of Hamlet and indicate that the languages the user would like to read the play in are Japanese and Portuguese. The software accesses the database, retrieving and then displaying for the user's view translations of Hamlet in both Japanese and Portuguese,* [Column 6, Lines 28-42]).

16. **Claims 38, and 41**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Erickson (*Pat. No. US 6,807,534, filed on May 31, 2000*).

Regarding **claim 38**, Schneid does not explicitly disclose the limitation of this instant claim

Ericson discloses allowing enforcement of instructions provided by an owner of the source document regarding legal use of the source document, the computer-based document management module adapted to allow security properties to be modified to a setting in each of the multiple documents that is more restrictive than the instructions provided by the owner (*the licensing is provided to creators of derivative media works, i.e., those who modify an original work of authorship and who obtain authorization to do so through an augmentation in the permissions data set. The modified DOCUMENT is then registered on a registration server and licensed through an authorization server. The DOCUMENT in this aspect preferably includes a sourceworks extension module which records the original and derivative authorship of the media. By retaining such information, a copyright "family tree" or electronic bibliographic record is maintained for the media, ([Column 3, Line 61 – Column 4, Line 7]).*

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Erickson with the teachings of Schneid for the purpose of providing on-line

licensing and copyright management for electronic media through a secure electronic format and registration ([Abstract] of Erickson).

Regarding **claim 41**, Erickson further discloses responsive to a selection by an owner of the source document, remove all rights of the owner regarding the source document but retain all original credits at an edition or object level of the source document (*A record of the media source works is also available through the VIEWER. The sourceworks extensions provide a bibliography of the authors of the media so that the appropriate authors are credited with their works even after the works are edited by a derivative author. The sourceworks extensions are typically available within a display--sometimes denoted herein as the "Source Works Display"-- at the user's computer terminal, [Column 6, Lines 8-16]).*

17. **Claims 39-40, 42, and 45**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneid (*Pub. No. US 2002/0107883, published on August 8, 2002*) in view of Ainsbury et al. (*Pat. No. US 6,078,924, published on June 20, 2000; hereinafter Ainsbury*).

Regarding **claim 39**, Schneid does not disclose the limitation of this instant claim.

Ainsbury discloses providing users of the source document with contact information of the owner for each of the plurality of objects of the source documents (*the Case Items are displayed in a list with each items' associated properties. Table 13 shows the property 'Author' which indicates user who set the collection item or added the information item,*

[Column 32, Lines 20-59]). *Table 13 also discloses the 'Owner' property which indicates the user name of current Case owner, [Column 30, Lines 13-34]).*

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Ainsbury with the teachings of Schneid for the purpose of providing a user with a market understanding necessary to execute rapid and knowledgeable decision making by organizing the library of information and providing analysis using multiple content-types ([Abstract] of Ainsbury).

Regarding **claim 40**, Ainsbury further discloses responsive to publication of the source document, lock all of the plurality of objects of the source document (*If the user creates a template from a Case, they are informed that the collection criteria for the Case Items and Search Items are cleared when the Case is saved as a template. The Case is saved as a template and the original Case is retained, [Column 40, Lines 46-50]),* and allow an owner of the source document to edit objects in each of the multiple documents after the source document has been published (*Users can then create a new Case from a template, the Case is created with the specified properties, Objectives, Case Items, and Search Items from the template. However, user can then modify these, adding, editing, or removing elements except the 'Case categories' attribute, which can only be edited by the owner of the template, [Column 37, Lines 49-55]).*

Regarding **claim 42**, Ainsbury further discloses responsive to a selection by an owner of the source document, enforce a right of the owner to require a user to include and retain contents of the source document in each of the multiple documents, the computer-based document management module adapted to allow the user to append an additional object into each of the multiple documents (*Users can then create a new Case from a template, the Case is created with the specified properties, Objectives, Case Items, and Search Items from the template. However, user can then modify these, adding, editing, or removing elements except the 'Case categories' attribute, which can only be edited by the owner of the template, [Column 37, Lines 49-55]).*

Regarding **claim 45**, Ainsbury further discloses the database contains a table that links a content identifier to an identifier of a container object of the source document. (*One of the primary functions of the Parsing Kernel (PK) is to read the source document and determine the page geometry. This geometry subdivides a document into the elements shows in Table 30. This table shows the 'Link' element which indicates an HREF to another document, or another part of this document, [Column 48, Line 40 -- Column 49, Line 25]).*

Conclusion

18. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

/Christian P. Chace/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165

Contact Information

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Son T. Hoang whose telephone number is (571) 270-1752. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday (7:00 AM – 4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on (571) 272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S.H./

Son T. Hoang

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2165

April 10, 2008